

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
AIKEN DIVISION

Roger L. Seabrooks, Jr.,)	
)	C/A No. 1:17-3168-TMC
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	ORDER
)	
)	
Lilly Randolph, <i>Doctor</i> ,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
)	

Plaintiff Roger L. Seabrooks, Jr., proceeding *pro se*, filed this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. (ECF No. 1). In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local Civil Rule 73.02, D.S.C., this matter was referred to a magistrate judge for pretrial handling. On ly 5, 2018, the Magistrate Judge filed a Report and Recommendation (“Report”) in which she recommended that the action be dismissed with prejudice for failure to prosecute. (ECF No. 36). The Plaintiff was informed of his right to file objections to the Report. (ECF No. 36 at 3). However, he did not file objections, and the time to do so has now run.

The Report has no presumptive weight and the responsibility to make a final determination in this matter remains with this court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976). In the absence of objections, this court is not required to provide an explanation for adopting the Report. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983). Rather, “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note). Furthermore, failure to file specific written objections to the Report results in a party’s waiver of the right to appeal the

district court's judgment based upon that recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841 (4th Cir. 1985); *United States v. Schronce*, 727 F.2d 91 (4th Cir. 1984).

After a thorough review of the Report and the record in this case, the court adopts the Magistrate Judge's Report (ECF No. 36) and incorporates it herein. Therefore, the action is **DISMISSED** with prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Timothy M. Cain
United States District Judge

July 24, 2018
Anderson, South Carolina